

Application Serial No. 10/583,881  
Reply to Office Action of May 18, 2010

PATENT  
Docket: CU-4891

**REMARKS**

In the Office Action dated May 18, 2010, claims 1-3, 5-9, and 11-13 are pending and are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a). The Applicant asserts that the rejections set forth in the Official Action have been overcome by amendment and/or are traversed by argument below.

In the Claims, please cancel claims 1-3, 5-6, 8-9, and 12-13. Claims 7 and 11 have been amended herein to be in independent form. Support for these amendments can be found in the original claims as well as the original disclosure in the description at line 29 on page 14 to line 2 on page 15. Please also add new claims 14 and 15.

Additional support for the amendments can be found in the description on page 14 line 29 to page 15 line 2, page 15, lines 20-27, and also on page 17 line 27 to page 18 line 1. The amendments to the claims can be viewed in the Amendments section in the Listing of claims beginning on page 2 of this paper. No new matter has been added.

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 2, 6, and 12 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over JP 06-142638 ("JP'638"), in view of U.S. 6,470,898 (Kamo).

Claims 1, 2, 6, and 12 have been cancelled herein therefore rendering the rejection of these claims moot. The Examiner is requested to withdraw the rejection.

The Examiner has also rejected claims 3, 5, 7-9, 11 and 13 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over JP 06-142638 ("JP'638"), in view of U.S. 6,470,898 (Kamo) and Smook (Handbook for Pulp and Paper Technologists).

Claims 3, 5, 8, 9, and 13 have been cancelled herein, and therefore, the rejection as to those claims is rendered moot.

Regarding claims 7 and 11 the Applicant respectfully disagrees and submits that the claims are non-obvious and allowable.

Application Serial No. 10/583,881  
Reply to Office Action of May 18, 2010

PATENT  
Docket: CU-4891

None of the references disclose the feature of amended claim 7, "the step of dewatering the paper piece comprises squeezing and dewatering of the water-washed paper piece by a roller, a centrifugal machine, or a squeezing machine" or the feature of amended claim 11, wherein "the dewatering device is a device configured to squeeze and dewater the water-washed paper piece by a roller, a centrifugal machine, or a squeezing machine".

In particular, a "piece of paper" as is disclosed in JP'638, paragraph 0008, does not correspond to "paper stock" as in claim 1 of Kamo. Therefore, the Applicant asserts that it is not obvious for a person skilled in the art to apply a "piece of paper" as in JP'638 to a "paper stock cleaning apparatus" as in claim 1 of Kamo.

Furthermore, even if a "piece of paper" as in JP'638 could be applied to "paper stock cleaning apparatus" as in Kamo, a substance that could be obtained by cleaning a "piece of paper" in a "paper stock cleaning apparatus" of Kamo still does not correspond to the "paper making stock" as in page 228, right column, line 5 of Smook, and in addition, "fibers" as in page 228, right column, line 8 of Smook. Therefore, it is not obvious to a person of skill in the art to apply a substance that would be obtained by cleaning a "piece of paper" as is disclosed in JP'638 in a "paper stock cleaning apparatus" as in Kamo, to a "paper machine" as in Smook.

In this way, at least "The act of crushing with agitation/mixing into water breaks the paper piece into fibers dispersed in water (i.e. pulp)." in lines 7-9 on page 3 of the Advisory Action and "the separated paper piece which is now part of the pulp" at line 10, page 3, of the Advisory Action is incorrect. Similarly, the discussion on pages 2 and 3 of the Advisory Action, are also technically in error.

None of the references disclose or suggest the features of amended claims 7 and 11. The Applicant submits that the claims, 7 and 11, are therefore, non-obvious and allowable. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully solicited.

Application Serial No. 10/583,881  
Reply to Office Action of May 18, 2010

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER PATENT  
Docket: CU-4891  
NOV 17 2010

CONCLUSIONS

The Applicant respectfully contends that all conditions of patentability are met in the pending claims. The Applicant respectfully submits that this application should be in condition for allowance. Furthermore, the Applicant respectfully requests favorable consideration.

Respectfully Submitted,

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Zareefa B. Flener, Pat. Reg. No. 52,896

Ladas & Parry, LLP  
224 South Michigan Avenue  
Suite 1600  
Chicago, IL 60604  
312/427-1300  
312/427-6668 (fax)